

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated April 9, 2005. Claims 1 to 17 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 14 and 16 are in independent form. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Regarding a formal matter, the specification has been amended to refer to Japanese Application No. 63-006619, instead of Japanese Application No. 05-062771. Japanese Application No. 63-006619 was cited in an Information Disclosure Statement dated October 18, 2001, and is seen to be a counterpart to Japanese Application No. 05-062771.

Turning to the Office Action, Claim 10 was objected to based on an informality. In response, Claim 10 has been amended. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this object are respectfully requested.

Claims 1 to 9, 11, 14, 16 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 4,931,965 (Kaneko) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,212,645 (Wildes); Claims 10 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Kaneko in view of Wildes and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,539,427 (Bricklin); and Claims 12 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Kaneko in view of Wildes and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,232,962 (Davis). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Regarding the § 103(a) rejections of Claims 10, 12 13 and 15, the Office Action refers to a Schmidt reference, instead of Wildes. Applicants' representative contacted the Examiner, who confirmed that any rejections over Schmidt are in fact over Wildes.

The present invention generally concerns an electronic board apparatus for transmitting data representing a handwritten image written on a predetermined board to an external computer. A determination is made as to whether or not the external computer can receive the data. If it is determined that the external computer cannot receive the data, the data is stored into storage means provided in the electronic board apparatus.

A feature of the present invention therefore lies in determining by an electronic board apparatus whether an external computer can receive data representing a handwritten image written on a predetermined board, and storing the data in a storage means by the electronic board apparatus if the external computer cannot receive the data.

Referring specifically to the claims, independent Claim 1 is directed to an electronic board apparatus for transmitting data representing a handwritten image written on a predetermined board to an external computer. The apparatus includes means for determining whether or not the external computer can receive the data, and storage means for storing the data. If it is determined that the external computer cannot receive the data, the data is stored into the storage means.

In a similar manner, independent Claim 16 is directed to a method.

Independent Claim 14 is directed to an electronic board apparatus. The apparatus includes data generation means for generating data representing a handwritten image written on a predetermined board, and means for transmitting the data to an external computer. The apparatus also includes means for determining whether or not the external computer can receive the data, and storage means for storing the data. If it is determined that the external computer cannot receive the data, the data is stored into the storage means.

The applied art is not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of the present invention. In particular, Kaneko, Wildes, Bricklin and Davis are not seen to disclose or suggest at least the feature of determining by an electronic board apparatus whether an external computer can receive data representing a handwritten image written on a predetermined board, and storing the data in a storage means by the electronic board apparatus if the external computer cannot receive the data.

As understood by Applicants, Kaneko discloses a coordinates input apparatus having an operation control unit adapted for computing coordinate positions. The operation control unit is capable of transmitting the computed coordinate positions to an external host computer. See Kaneko, column 4, lines 15 to 18; and Figure 1. As acknowledged in the Office Action, however, Kaneko is not seen to disclose or suggest determining by an electronic board apparatus whether an external computer can receive data representing a handwritten image written on a predetermined board, and storing the data in a storage means by the electronic board apparatus if the external computer cannot receive the data.

Wildes was cited for its alleged disclosure of determining whether an external computer can receive data, and storing data in storage means if the external computer cannot receive the data. As understood by Applicants, Wildes discloses a system in which data is copied into a raw data ring buffer. The data includes all analog inputs and all digital inputs (the digital inputs include a copy of the outputs). The buffer is the memory area used for the temporary storage of information that has just been received. See Wildes, column 7, lines 4 to 13. If a connection to a data or event server is severed, a data dump and network log tasks redirect their output to a null device, then periodically try

to reestablish the connection to their respective servers. See Wildes, column 10, lines 25 to 30.

Although Wildes may be seen to disclose the copying of data in a raw data buffer ring, it is not seen to disclose or suggest the storing of data based on a determination of whether or not an external computer can receive the data. Instead, Wildes teaches that all analog and digital input data are copied into the raw data buffer ring. Accordingly, Wildes is not seen to disclose or suggest determining by an electronic board apparatus whether an external computer can receive data representing a handwritten image written on a predetermined board, and storing the data in a storage means by the electronic board apparatus if the external computer cannot receive the data.

In addition, Bricklin and Davis have been reviewed and are not seen to compensate for the deficiencies of Kaneko and Wildes.

Accordingly, based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, independent Claims 1, 14 and 16 are believed to be allowable over the applied references.

The other claims in the application are each dependent from the independent claims and are believed to be allowable over the applied references for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

No other matters being raised, it is believed that the entire application is fully in condition for allowance, and such action is courteously solicited.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,


John D. Magluyan
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No.: 56,867

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-2200
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 97291v1